

REMARKS

Applicant will address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claim 58 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, Claim 58 states that a value of an electric potential of the electric discharging power source line takes a value that is between an electric potential of the bias signal line and an electric potential of the biasing side power source line. This feature is clearly disclosed at page 37, ln. 20 - page 38, ln. 18 of the specification of the application as filed. Hence, there is clear support for this claim, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1-3, 8, 9, 35, 36, 41 and 57

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-3, 8, 9, 35, 36, 41 and 57 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over "Applicant's admitted prior art" in view of Clark (US 6,157,016). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

More specifically, Applicants do not believe that Clark (the Examiner admits that "Applicant's admitted prior art" does not disclose or suggest this feature) discloses or suggests the feature of independent Claims 1, 35 and 57 of "wherein an absolute value of a voltage between a gate and a source of the biasing transistor is equivalent to a minimum value of an absolute value of a voltage between a gate and a source that is necessary for making the biasing transistor into a

conductive state.” The Examiner, however, appears to be contending that the reference reads on the particular language of the claims.

Therefore, in order to advance the prosecution of this application and clarify the claimed invention, Applicants are amending independent Claims 1, 35 and 57 as follows: “wherein an absolute value of a voltage between a gate and a source of the biasing transistor is ~~equivalent to a minimum value of~~ higher than an absolute value of a voltage between a gate and a source that is ~~necessary for making a threshold voltage of~~ the biasing transistor ~~into a conductive state.~~” The amended claim language tracks the language in the specification at page 36, lns. 6-10.

It is respectfully submitted that this amended feature is not disclosed or suggested by Clark or “Applicant’s admitted prior art.” Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 35 and 57 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 10-14

The Examiner also rejects Claims 10-14 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over “Applicant’s admitted prior art” in view of Clark and further in view of Silver et al. (US 6,690,842). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed supra for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicant is also adding new Claims 89-106 herewith. As no new matter is being added, it is

respectfully requested that these new claims be entered and examined.

Independent Claims 89 and 98 include the feature of dependent Claim 3 (now canceled) of the electric discharging power source line connected to the biasing power source line. The Examiner contends that this feature is disclosed in both "Applicant's admitted prior art" and Clark. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the claims are allowable over these references. Therefore, if the Examiner is going to continue to make this assertion, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner provide a complete explanation of how this feature is allegedly shown in the cited references.

The fee for new claims has been calculated as shown below.

	Claims Remaining After Amendment		Highest Number Previously Paid For	Present Extra	Rate	Fee
Total	32	-	33	0	(small entity) x 25 (others) x 50	\$ 0.00
Independent	5	-	7	0	(small entity) x 100 (others) x 200	\$ 0.00
Multiple Dependent (None)					(small entity) + 180 (others) + 360	\$ 0.00
TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEES						\$ 0.00

No fee is believed due for the new claims and new independent claims. If any fee should be due, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these new claims be entered and allowed.

Conclusion


It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and

should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account no. 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Mark J. Murphy', is written over a horizontal line.

Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, Ltd.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 26568